

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 27, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 52-53, 55 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Hanson. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 52 recites, *inter alia*, “the internal computer system being further associated with a device at the location that can be controlled by the outside entity via the internal computer system; . . . wherein the triggering event activates an ability to allow control of the device at the location to be assigned to the outside entity to obtain data from the device to the outside entity.” Support for this feature is found on at least page 15, lines 1-10 of Applicants’ specification describing outside entity 390 controlling one or more component systems including a sensing apparatus 314, observation device 316 and emergency response device 318. Hanson fails to teach this feature. Hanson teaches a device 12 which the Examiner construes as the internal computer system. Device 12 communicates with a vital sign detector 30 which the Examiner construes as the claimed sensing apparatus. In applying Hanson, the Examiner likens the locator service 36 to the claimed device. The locator service 36 is not “at the location” with the internal computer system as recited in claim 52. Further, a triggering event does not cause an outside entity to obtain control of the locator service. The locator service 36 in Hanson dynamically keeps track of devices 12 through GPS. Thus, there is no triggering event that initiates the locator service 36. The locator service continually or periodically tracks location of the device 12 (column 4, lines 34-44). Thus, Hanson fails to teach at least these elements of claim 52.

For at least the above reasons, claim 52 is patentable over Hanson. Independent claim 53 recites features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 52 and is patentable over Hanson for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 52. Claims 55 and 56 depend from claim 53 and are patentable over Hanson for at least the same reasons.

Claims 48-50, 54, 59 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable

over Hanson in view of Gaos. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

With respect to claims 48-50 and 54, Gaos was relied upon for disclosing secure communications and digital certificates, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Hanson discussed above with reference to claim 52. Claims 48-50 depend from claim 52 and are patentable over Hanson in view of Gaos for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 52. Claim 54 depends upon claim 53, and is patentable over Hanson in view of Gaos for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 53.

Claim 59 recites, *inter alia*, “a control module allowing an outside entity to control the operations of the devices at the location associated with a local area network upon detection of a triggering event at the location by the sensing element; wherein the devices include VoIP capable devices and a television at the location.” Hanson makes no reference to an outside entity controlling devices at the location or that the devices include a television. With respect to claim 59, Gaos was relied upon for teaching secure tunneling but fails to cure the deficiencies of Hanson. Gaos does not teach assuming control of a device at a location where a triggering event is detected.

For at least the above reasons, claim 59 is patentable over Hanson in view of Gaos. Claim 61 depends from claim 59 and is patentable over Hanson in view of Gaos for at least the same reasons.

Claims 60-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Gaos and Kung. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Kung was relied upon for disclosing quality of service measures and multimedia information, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Hanson in view of Gaos discussed above with reference to claim 59. Claims 60-62 depend from claim 59 and are patentable over Hanson in view of Gaos and Kung for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 59.

Claims 57-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Gerdt. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Gerdt was relied upon for disclosing a moving object being a vehicle, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Hanson discussed above with reference to claim 53. Claims 57-58 depend from claim 53 and are patentable over Hanson in view of Gerdt for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 53.

For at least the reasons advanced above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner is cordially requested to telephone, if the Examiner believes that it would be advantageous to the disposition of this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment, which may be required for this amendment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in any petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: March 17, 2008